

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X **Docket#**
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 20-cr-00350-NGG-1
: :
: :
- versus - : U.S. Courthouse
: Brooklyn, New York
: :
SAM RESTO, : March 24, 2021
Defendant : 9:07 AM
-----X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR DETENTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHERYL L. POLLAK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S:
(VIA VIDEO/TELEPHONE)

For the Government:

Mark J. Lesko, Esq.
Acting U.S. Attorney

BY: **Sara Winik, Esq.**
Assistant U.S. Attorney
271 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, New York 11201

For the Defendant:

Cesar DeCastro, Esq.
Law Offices of
Cesar DeCastro
7 WTC, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10007

Transcription Service:

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.
61 Beatrice Avenue
West Islip, New York 11795
laFerrara44@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording,
transcript produced by transcription service

Proceedings

1 THE CLERK: So we have a Criminal Cause for a
2 Bail Application. It's 20-cr-350, United States v. Sam
3 Resto.

4 Counsel, state your appearances please starting
5 with the government.

6 MS. WINIK: Good morning, your Honor.
7 Sarah Winik on behalf of the United States.

8 THE COURT: Good morning.

9 MR. DECASTRO: Good morning.
10 Cesar DeCastro on behalf of Mr. Resto.

11 THE COURT: All right. Good morning.

12 Mr. Resto, we're here today for a bail
13 application. Normally, we would be in the courthouse.
14 All of us would be there together but because of the
15 COVID pandemic, there are very few proceedings going on
16 in person in the courthouse.

17 Congress has authorized us to proceed by way of
18 video or telephone conference if the defendant agrees and
19 the Court finds it is appropriate under the circumstances
20 facing the Court at this time.

21 Mr. DeCastro, have you discussed proceeding
22 remotely with your client?

23 MR. DECASTRO: I have, Judge.

24 THE COURT: And he --

25 MR. DECASTRO: He --

Proceedings

1 THE COURT: -- does he agree?

2 MR. DECASTRO: Yes.

3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

4 Mr. Resto, do you agree to proceed this morning
5 by way of video conference -- telephone conference for
6 you, I guess.

7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

8 THE COURT: All right. So Mr. DeCastro, it's
9 your application for bail. Why don't you start?

10 MR. DECASTRO: Sure. Thank you, Judge.

11 So I think I want to start just -- I'm
12 obviously not going to repeat. You know, we've prepared
13 a written bail application. I've provided you with the
14 package and the details of that package but I do want to
15 address the government's opposition which I only received
16 yesterday and some points to make regarding that and then
17 I'll conclude.

18 But you know as it often does, the government's
19 only relevant arguments here relate largely to the
20 circumstances of the case and the alleged strength of its
21 case which of course are appropriate factors under the
22 Bail Reform Act, I'm not minimizing those but what is
23 glaring in my view from the government's submission is
24 that they just don't address several of our arguments
25 which for example, they do not address at all how home

Proceedings

1 detention and electronic monitoring would not be
2 sufficient. They say lots of things about an incident or
3 incidents that occurred last summer but they don't really
4 address that.

5 They don't really provide any other option or
6 leave open any possibility short of detention and don't
7 even address that issue. They do not really address his
8 current ability to flee. They don't even address that
9 argument other than to say that he had a job a year ago
10 and other than general arguments regarding anybody else
11 and potential to flee.

12 They don't even bother to address the hard and
13 court-published statistics regarding location monitoring
14 and how it can ensure the safety of the community. They
15 don't even argue that or even address it.

16 I think the first thing I really need to point
17 out regarding the submission is that, you know, right out
18 of the gate from second paragraph on, the first thing
19 they say is Judge Kuo entered an order of detention with
20 a finding that there's a serious risk that the defendant
21 will not appear, suggesting that, you know, in granting
22 bail, this court would somehow be disagreeing or
23 overruling a colleague.

24 That is far from the case. We consented to
25 bail and detention at the time of arraignment. We did

Proceedings

1 not have a package together. There was no argument made
2 whatsoever.

3 So yes, there was an order of detention at
4 issue but there was no argument, there was no finding.
5 There was no -- none of these things were before Judge
6 Kuo.

7 The second point is that they have made --
8 they're raising comment about earlier incidents for which
9 he is not charged and for which was just disclosed to the
10 defense days ago really. I think it was maybe Friday or
11 Thursday, whenever I spoke to them orally and about which
12 they produced materials yesterday.

13 I know it's a bail argument. We're not talking
14 about Rule 16 issues but it's a little bizarre to me that
15 they are talking about materials, undercover agent
16 recordings of the defendant that are being produced
17 nearly eight months after his presentment in the case and
18 which I learned about days ago and I still -- the package
19 may have arrived at my office, I haven't even opened it.
20 I can't verify anything that they say. I can't look at
21 the context of the conversations of what my client said.
22 So I throw that out there for the Court that I am going
23 to be in a position where I don't even have the ability
24 to really talk about some of the things that they have
25 said and of course, I have had seven minutes with my

Proceedings

1 client before a filing that was yesterday, so -- when we
2 filed our bail application on March 16th.

3 So with respect to one issue that the
4 government raises, it is -- the government characterizes
5 my arguments regarding the effect of Mr. Resto's
6 difficult detention while awaiting trial in this case and
7 whether -- and my arguments as to whether he would be a
8 risk in engaging in any further criminal conduct as
9 perplexing.

10 I don't know what's very perplexing about it.
11 It's a deterrence issue. It's not -- it argues that --
12 the government argues that his arrest when he was given a
13 desk appearance ticket in state court and being arrested
14 protesting didn't deter him, so why would spending eight
15 months in the MDC locked in his cell where he gets out at
16 best two-hours-a-day for eight months, contracts COVID
17 and has to endure the uncertainties of how it will affect
18 him all alone, is sort of meaningless. To me, that's
19 sort of a shocking argument. The government can say it
20 doesn't change whatever his dangerousness is but I don't
21 know what's very perplexing about it. Their argument
22 seems to suggest that there is no amount of jail time
23 that will deter this first time -- he has no criminal
24 record, first time offender.

25 And now they argue that he's a risk of flight

Proceedings

1 because he doesn't want to return to the onerous
2 conditions of the MDC, so when I have been spending the
3 last year hearing the government argue about how it's no
4 so onerous at the MDC. So I am actually quite perplexed
5 by their argument with respect to theirs.

6 But my argument is pretty simple. You know,
7 he's never been in jail before. Now he goes into the MDC
8 and what are as I think anyone in this call and the world
9 will acknowledge, are very difficult conditions. We
10 don't even have to have an argument. I don't even have
11 to say anything about whether I agree with how the BOP
12 has handled it or not, it doesn't matter, even assuming
13 they've handled everything perfectly, it is very, very
14 difficult on detainees.

15 And I say -- and if that doesn't wake someone
16 up to say whoa, what are we doing, you know, I don't know
17 what would. The government's submission also no matter
18 what they've written doesn't change or affect our
19 argument that he has lived a largely law-abiding life.
20 Nothing they write calls that into question. He's never
21 been conflicted of a crime and as I said, he was given a
22 -- he has an open DAT and an open protest case.

23 The discipline in the Army, I am not aware of
24 that, that again I don't -- unless I missed it in the
25 discovery which is possible. I didn't see that produced

Proceedings

1 to me either.

2 What's glaringly missing too is what can the
3 government point to about his current circumstances to
4 show that he's some sort of danger or flight risk. What
5 they would do as they do in other cases is they say oh,
6 look, who is he in contact with; haven't done that here.
7 Look who is visiting him; well, of course, he hasn't had
8 visitors -- of course he hasn't had visitors.

9 They would say oh, look at his disciplinary
10 record. He's in there in the jail causing trouble,
11 causing unrest, trying to get people to fight the system.
12 No, there's no disciplinary record because he doesn't
13 have any, as far as I'm aware of. He's been a model
14 prisoner. He's been reading.

15 And on flight, I don't know where they think
16 he's going. They just say he could hide in plain sight.
17 I don't know how he has the means to do that. He did
18 have a job eight months ago. He does not have a job
19 anymore. He would be supported by his family. He has
20 earned zero dollars per month for the past eight months.

21 The other argument in their papers that I want
22 to address is the reference to the Mattis and Rahman case
23 which the government appears to be arguing and I'll let
24 them address it, that that case seems to be where those
25 defendants are out on bail, they appear to be arguing

Proceedings

1 that that case is sort of less serious than this one,
2 that here we're kind of more serious.

3 And the government focuses its arguments on the
4 findings of the Circuit and what it does is it ignores
5 its office's -- its own office's arguments about those
6 defendants' conduct in all their papers. All throughout
7 the government's papers in that other case, they talk
8 about how those defendant's conduct was premeditated, it
9 was dangerous. They pose an imminent threat to public
10 safety. They fire bombed a car with people all around
11 it. They tried to recruit others to fire bomb other
12 cars. They report -- one of them reported a video before
13 talking about violence against the NYPD. That's all in
14 their papers too and that -- the suggestion that this
15 case is materially different in some way, I think is not
16 supported by the record.

17 In fact, I mean they had said to me directly
18 that this matter is not as serious as that matter.
19 First, we're facing a five-year mandatory minimum. They
20 are facing a ten-year mandatory minimum. Both defendants
21 are released on bail.

22 They argue here that Mr. Resto carefully
23 planned and organized and took substantial steps with
24 ample time. The bail findings in the other case
25 establish that -- I mean, the bail submissions by the

Proceedings

1 government that those other defendants attempted to
2 distribute cocktails to witnesses, to others, to attack
3 other police cars and that people were standing around
4 which is not this case when they acted in that case.

5 So even assuming at the time of his presentment
6 eight months ago that he was a risk of flight based on
7 the evidence of his attempt to avoid apprehension, he is
8 not currently a risk of flight. There is -- well now
9 pretrial services is apparently changing the
10 recommendation. I wasn't aware of that until minutes
11 ago. My understanding was pretrial services knowing all
12 the facts that I knew at the time, recommended release
13 with appropriate bail package. He is no longer employed.
14 He has no travel documents. The government has them. He
15 doesn't even have an identification.

16 With home detention, electronic monitoring,
17 strict pretrial supervision, I posit, where he is going?
18 Where is he going in the middle of this current pandemic
19 with no resources? And we have presented a substantial
20 bail package with people that would have moral suasion
21 and have jobs where the government could garnish wages.
22 Yes, a few people, two or three are on disability and/or
23 retired. Well, they hold serious moral suasion over him
24 and the rest are gainfully employed and working and as
25 you know, they're on this call.

Proceedings

1 Mr. Resto has overcome the presumption of
2 detention in this case. He's entitled to the least
3 restrictions conditions to ensure his appearance and
4 safeguard the safety of the community and I think our
5 package does exactly that.

6 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr.
7 DeCastro.

8 MR. DECASTRO: Thank you, Judge.

9 THE COURT: Ms. Winik?

10 MS. WINIK: Thank you, Judge. As the Court's
11 aware, this is a presumption case and the defendant has
12 not and cannot rebut the presumption that he's both a
13 danger to the community and a flight risk. His own
14 actions and his own words show that he is both.

15 I'll start with danger to the community. Mr.
16 DeCastro asked what can the government point to to show
17 that the defendant is a danger to the community? Mr.
18 DeCastro also tries to paint the defendant as someone who
19 got caught up in the heat of the moment while protesting
20 and made a grave mistake but that's not the defendant
21 here. The defendant's emotions didn't get the better of
22 him one night.

23 What can the government point to to show that
24 he is a danger? He's a danger because over a month he
25 plotted and he planned multiple attacks on the NYPD, on

Proceedings

1 law enforcement and on the City of New York. And I'll go
2 through a couple of those dangerous acts.

3 The defendant coordinated with others to scout
4 locations to burn police cars and to take down New York
5 statutes (sic). He purchased materials including a
6 fully-functioning crossbow and gasoline to carry out his
7 attacks. He watched YouTube videos about making
8 explosives to carry out those attacks. He created
9 encrypted group chats on messaging platforms to carry out
10 those attacks and he even discussed creating an ISIS-link
11 network where the initiation process would require
12 members to burn a police vehicle or to burn a random car.

13 And throughout all of that, over a month, the
14 defendant repeatedly made statements that he did not care
15 of his actions hurt law enforcement officers or hurt
16 innocent bystanders and according to the defendant, he
17 wanted to burn it all down.

18 And his actions and his statements were not
19 just bluster because his plotting and his planning
20 culminated on July 29th when he set fire to a police
21 vehicle on the Upper West Side on a residential street
22 just yards away from where families were asleep and then
23 right after that attack, the defendant stated that he was
24 not done, that he could not wait to burn another car and
25 that any time the police arrested a protestor, he wanted

Proceedings

1 to burn a cop car in order to send a message.

2 And this wasn't the first time the defendant
3 came close to setting a police vehicle on fire. A few
4 weeks earlier, he traveled to Bay Ridge, New York,
5 purchased a gasoline, purchased a jerry can to put the
6 gasoline in, identified a car that he wanted to burn and
7 almost carried out the attack but abandoned the plan
8 because the police secured the area.

9 And all of this is to say that the defendant
10 did not make a lapse in judgment on one night and
11 therefore his dangerousness could somehow be written off
12 or dissipated over time and it was just an outlier. The
13 defendant's consistent conduct shows that he is willing
14 and he is able to commit acts that put our community
15 members and our first responders in grave danger.

16 it is not the type of dangerous conduct that
17 over the course of a couple of months as protests died
18 down a little bit dissipates. The defendant's dangerous
19 conduct goes beyond the political tensions of the summer.
20 He's someone who over the course of weeks watched videos
21 about making explosives, purchased weapons, discussed
22 creating a terrorist network, scouted locations and this
23 is someone who remains a danger to the community.

24 I'll address the defendant -- Mr. DeCastro's
25 comment about productions of the discovery. We've been

Proceedings

1 in long talks with Mr. DeCastro. We've produced
2 discovery on a rolling basis for months. He knew there
3 were more audio recordings coming. We produced hundreds
4 of hours of audio recordings to him.

5 And much of what we produced to him this week
6 is as we told him, he already has, it's just multiple
7 audio of it. So I guess I'm surprised by his surprise
8 that there's still discovery coming but I don't think any
9 of that goes to bail. He's well aware of his client's
10 own statements.

11 I want to address the defendant's argument that
12 prison time has lessened his dangerousness and that's
13 just not a persuasive argument because the defendant in
14 this case, his conduct and his statements show that the
15 intervention of law enforcement motivates him to increase
16 his criminal conduct and doesn't deter him and the
17 defendant shows that that is his -- that is how he is
18 because when he was arrested on July 15th, he said he
19 wanted to burn a cop car in retaliation and then he
20 followed through on that promise on July 29th when he did
21 light a police vehicle on fire.

22 And then he said in his own words that every
23 time someone is arrested, he wants to burn a police
24 vehicle or a random car in retaliation.

25 And the defendant now claims that somehow this

Proceedings

1 time is different but the community should not be put at
2 risk by giving the defendant the benefit of the doubt
3 here when his statements and his actions show that he has
4 no respect for the law and that he is willing to plan and
5 execute violence in retaliation for the police doing
6 their job, just like they did here in keeping the
7 community safe.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Winik, I was going to say could
9 you please address Mr. DeCastro's argument that home
10 detention or electronic monitoring with I guess GPS
11 surveillance would be enough to protect the community
12 from what you're arguing here is the danger.

13 MS. WINIK: Yes, Judge. I'll say this case is
14 not the type of case where the government just gets up
15 here and says there's a five-year mandatory minimum, that
16 therefore creates, you know, a strong likelihood that
17 he's a flight risk. That's not this case.

18 This case is where defendant has shown that
19 he's a flight risk. He tauntingly left a message for law
20 enforcement saying "too late" with a smiley face. He had
21 his passport with him when he was arrested. He told law
22 enforcement officers that he was planning to flee and
23 that he was hoping to put them off of his trail.

24 This is somebody who has already not just shown
25 but said to law enforcement, I am a flight risk here and

Proceedings

1 the reason that home detention and electronic monitoring
2 are not sufficient here is because that does not stop
3 someone who wants to flee. Right now there's limited
4 home visits. The defendant could just take off his ankle
5 monitor and flee and you don't need a passport, you don't
6 need -- I think Mr. DeCastro misunderstands what being a
7 flight risk means. It doesn't mean going to Mexico and
8 never coming back. It means leaving law enforcement's
9 supervision. It could be in a basement in New York and
10 that would be a flight risk and defendant already has
11 shown that he is a flight risk.

12 I'll add that there's limited home visits. If
13 the concern is, you know, can he just take off his ankle
14 bracelet and flee, the defendant has shown that he has no
15 respect for the law, that he doesn't respect the system,
16 that he doesn't respect police. That he's willing to
17 burn -- you know, he doesn't care if random people are
18 injured. He doesn't care if law enforcement's injured.
19 There's absolutely no guarantee that he will respect home
20 confinement and if he does, he'll be out of the reach of
21 law enforcement and this isn't just us saying that about
22 a random defendant. It's the government saying this
23 about a defendant who has said I want to flee. I was
24 planning to flee. I do not respect the law.

25 And in terms of the bail package, it's just an

Proceedings

1 insufficient bail package. I'll note that before the
2 court appearance started, Mr. DeCastro's -- I'm sorry,
3 Mr. Resto's sister told the court deputy, the court clerk
4 that Mr. Resto's mother was nervous and didn't really
5 want to be a part of this and that's why she hadn't
6 dialed in and I believe she eventually dialed in but
7 forget the fact that many of these sureties are
8 financially -- don't have -- are unemployed, have no
9 financial incentive to ensure the defendant's compliance
10 with the law for his appearance in court, you know, it --
11 based on their own statements, they're insufficient
12 sureties.

13 And I'll just add that if the goal of home
14 detention or of a proposed package is to ensure his
15 appearance at court, it's also to ensure the safety of
16 the community and there's nothing to say that this bail
17 package will protect the community from danger when the
18 defendant has already stated that he doesn't care if
19 innocent people die or if he hurts innocent people and
20 his risk is greater than just fleeing, it's putting the
21 community at risk if he is back out there.

22 THE COURT: Can you address Mr. DeCastro's
23 argument with respect to the other two individuals who
24 were released who faced more serious charges and who have
25 been released on bail?

Proceedings

1 MS. WINIK: Yes, the (indiscernible) United
2 States v. Mattis, the Second Circuit opinion there. I'm
3 not the prosecutor on that case. All I can speak to is
4 the Second Circuit opinion and how the Second Circuit
5 described their actions and the Second Circuit described
6 these actions of the defendants, you know, no matter what
7 the government -- however the government argued, the
8 Court said I made a finding that these people did not
9 plan in advance, there was no surreptitious -- that there
10 was no planning in advance, they were at a protest where
11 emotions ran high and there was no extension planning and
12 that's the exact opposite of this defendant.

13 So this defendant planned for months. This
14 defendant took steps to organize his attacks, to recruit
15 others, to buy materials, to scout out his locations, to
16 find places to put caltrops that he could put on the
17 ground, so that the police vehicles tires would get
18 slashed. That's the exact opposite of how the Court
19 described the defendants in those cases.

20 Here, the defendant didn't just act in one
21 night out of emotion. The evidence shows that he act --
22 you know, he planned for a month and that's how that case
23 is different. I understand how the Court can find if you
24 get emotional in the heat of the moment and one night
25 (audio interference) a grave mistake, how you're not a

Proceedings

1 danger to the community or how a bail package could
2 ensure that you're not a danger to the community but this
3 is someone who discussed and planned a terrorist network,
4 modeled after ISIS to commit wanton acts of violence
5 against our law enforcement officers. That's not someone
6 who just got overwhelmed in the moment at a protest.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 Mr. DeCastro, do you want to respond? I think
9 -- are you muted?

10 MR. DECASTRO: Sorry, I was on mute. Sorry
11 about that.

12 THE COURT: That's okay.

13 MR. DECASTRO: So let me get the -- again,
14 they're talking about statements that they produced to me
15 -- they called me on March 19th and told me hey, there's
16 this other incident we want to tell you about. So I
17 don't really know -- I don't understand why they wouldn't
18 do that eight months -- I do understand it because I made
19 a bail application and now all of the sudden I'm getting
20 other things.

21 But you know so again, the planning to flee --
22 the distinction I've made is yeah, he made statements
23 about how he was going to flee law enforcement. That is
24 a huge difference than being detained, arrested, being
25 out on bail and being under the supervision of this

Proceedings

1 court.

2 It's interesting, the government wants to use
3 all of these statements that he said to law enforcement,
4 yeah, he also sat with them and talked to them for like
5 two hours. So this is someone that may have been
6 thinking he was going to do one thing and now reality as
7 set in.

8 They still have not even come close to
9 addressing how home detention with electronic monitoring
10 doesn't work and the reason they can't is because it
11 works because we see it every day working. That's why
12 the statistics are what they are. That's why 99 percent
13 according to -- that's why I quoted the statistic from
14 the Court itself, 99 percent of pretrial defendants on
15 federal location monitoring remain free of any arrests
16 for a violent offense, violence, during supervision which
17 is what they're pointing to as the big concern.

18 So the government as they often do also in
19 their response is they say this package is insufficient,
20 it's just insufficient but never do they say what would
21 be sufficient. They do say detention but if a package is
22 sufficient, then what is it? But apparently that just
23 doesn't come into the calculation.

24 I don't know what his mother said during this
25 prior -- before I got on the line. I do know she's very

Proceedings

1 nervous, who wouldn't be nervous and uncomfortable? She
2 doesn't want to be part of an uncomfortable experience
3 where she's going to hear the government make all of
4 these arguments.

5 I have been in contact with his mother, his
6 sister, like they are on me all the time. They are the
7 ones that have been providing me everything I need for a
8 bail package. So the thought that they're not supportive
9 of him is beyond -- is so far from the truth, it's
10 ridiculous.

11 The government also says in response to the
12 Mattis and Rahman, that well, I'm not the prosecutor on
13 the case, so I can only speak to the Second Circuit
14 opinion. I mean, that's ridiculous.

15 First of all, the filings are all public. I
16 read them all. There's 200 pages of filings. There's
17 transcripts. And their office filed it. So if a lawyer
18 in my office is arguing something, I don't say I don't
19 have access to that. I mean that's -- it's just
20 ridiculous.

21 They argued that all the same arguments here,
22 how dangerous they were how dangerous to public safety
23 they were and not only one judge, Judge Gold, not only
24 Judge Brodie, then the Circuit all concluded that they
25 should be out on bail in what is a much more serious case

Proceedings

1 but instead the government now throws out oh, it's a
2 terrorist network now. Oh, he's charged with a five-year
3 mandatory minimum. They're charged with a ten-year
4 mandatory minimum and their office argue all the same
5 safety issues. Thanks, Judge.

6 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I guess
7 what I would say is I am fairly familiar with the other
8 case. So I do know the arguments that the government
9 made.

10 I think unfortunately, I agree with the
11 government here. The circumstances are different in the
12 sense that according to the government and the evidence
13 that the government has cited, Mr. Resto did not do this
14 in the heat of the moment, caught up in a protest which
15 is clearly what was going on in the Mattis case.

16 The evidence that the evidence has cited about
17 his planning for over a month, his attempts at least once
18 in Bay Ridge to do it which thanks Heavens was halted,
19 his statements about retaliation, burning cop cars and
20 retaliation, all of these things, the purchase of the
21 crossbow, the YouTube videos that they cite, now I
22 understand, Mr. DeCastro maybe you haven't seen all this
23 stuff and maybe it's not there. Obviously, I haven't
24 seen the government's evidence, I can only rely on Ms.
25 Winik's representation but based on all of that, I find

Proceedings

1 that the circumstances of this case are different and
2 that home detention would not address the danger to the
3 community here.

4 As Ms. Winik notes, you know, people do cut off
5 their ankle bracelets. Unfortunately, I've been witness
6 to that in the past and they flee and even though they
7 don't even leave the community, it can take over a year
8 to find them and if in fact he is bent on retaliation or
9 burning down Central Park, that's something that we can't
10 prevent if he does decide to take off his ankle bracelet.

11 I mean I guess what I would say is I'm going to
12 keep in place the order of detention that was previously
13 entered by Judge Kuo based on my finding of the
14 presumption of danger to the community has not been
15 overcome by the package that you've presented.

16 I will say this, Mr. DeCastro, based upon your
17 statements that you have not had an opportunity to review
18 all of the evidence that the government has been citing
19 here today to me, if you do go back and determine that
20 any of it is not accurate, I think you have the right to
21 come back and revisit this issue with the Court.

22 But at this point, I am going to deny the bail
23 application and leave in place what Judge Kuo found as
24 well, okay? Anything else today?

25 MS. WINIK: Not from the government, your

Proceedings

1 Honor.

2 MR. DECASTRO: Not from the defense, Judge.

3 Thank you.

4 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

5 MS. WINIK: Thank you.

6 (Matter Concluded)

7 -o0o-

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, LINDA FERRARA, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic sound-recording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this 29th day of April 2021.


Linda Ferrara

AAERT CET 656

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.